

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Harry D. Leinenweber	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	11 C 4219	DATE	7/5/2011
CASE TITLE	Hoeller vs. Ladas & Parry LLP, et al.		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied as moot.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Notices mailed by Judicial staff.
Mailed AO 450 form.

STATEMENT

Plaintiff Timothy Hoeller brings the instant complaint against Ladas & Parry LLP, an intellectual property law firm, and others. He seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the Court is required to screen an indigent Plaintiff's complaint and dismiss it if it is frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Plaintiff's complaint is largely incomprehensible. He contends, "the patent attorneys supporting the mobile phone industry have devised a scheme to incur fraud, under so-called reverse patent application development which is not properly regulated, complacent government offices contributing to waste, and lacking appropriate leadership." The Court is at a loss to understand what this means. Plaintiff included several documents attached to his complaint, including a letter from Apple, Inc. rejecting a proposal from Hoeller, the nature of which is unclear.

District courts must construe pro se complaints liberally and allow an opportunity to amend where it appears the litigant would be able to state a meritorious claim. *Donald v. Cook County Sheriff's Dep't*, 95 F.3d 548, 555 (7th Cir. 1996). However, neither the complaint nor any of the attached documents come close to stating a claim against any named Defendant or anyone else, so Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed with prejudice. His motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied as moot.